

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, a certified translation of the priority document is not required to preserve Applicants' foreign priority claim under §119. A certified translation is only required if needed to perfect priority during prosecution.

The claims have been amended to overcome the outstanding objections and §112 rejections, without narrowing the scope of the claims, and withdrawal is requested.

The §101 rejection has been amended by amending claim 10 to recite a computer readable storage medium, and claim 11 has been cancelled. Accordingly, since a computer readable storage medium is statutory subject matter, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-3 and 10-11 stand rejected under §102 on the basis of Hurst et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0007646 A1). In response, Applicants traverse the rejection because Hurst fails to disclose (or suggest) the features recited in the amended claims.

Hurst teaches a method of controlling the use of digital content by encrypting and decrypting data. In particular, Hurst teaches a technique related to protection of copyrights into a method and device or protecting content having digital write such as copyright by using a conventional Digital Rights Management (DRM) technique when users such as consumers download such content from a center.

Hurst discloses a technique relating only to a DRM for preventing a violation of copyrights. Therefore, this technique does not provide any advantages to the user's copyrighted works.

Hurst merely relates to digital copyrighted works, and does not relate to protection of private information. Thus, even if the digital copyrighted works in Hurst are replaced with private information, the ten prerequisites or adopted configuration discussed in Applicants' specification on page 13, line 9 through page 17 are not satisfied. Hurst cannot protect private information like the present invention because the private information is not protected by using a special method, such as, for example, a configuration in which the information is protected not in units of data of each person, but in units of names. Therefore, Hurst is different from the present invention.

In particular, the present invention includes a technique of controlling use of licenses and digital content by which digital documents describing licenses are encrypted to be transmitted and received among users. In this manner, only the users having proper digital documents can use digital content.

For the above purpose, it is sufficient to protect content having digital rights in units of pieces of digital copyrighted work (one title of a tune in the case of, for example, music data).

In the present application, the concept of privacy protection is implemented by using ten prerequisites as discussed above that the parties using private information have to satisfy in order to comply with the standards regarding private information protection. The configuration of the present invention satisfies these ten prerequisites. Accordingly, in the technique of the present invention, private information is utilized in a safe manner and advantages are realized.

In the present invention, 1) private information is handled; 2) each user as a consumer transmits, in a protected manner, his/her private information to a service provider that uses the private information; and 3) for the service provider, one unit of private data is not data that has to be protected, but a block of data (for example, a name list including 5000 users' names or more) is the data that has to be protected, and the conventional DRM technique of protecting data in a one-by-one manner can not be employed for this purpose. Accordingly, a configuration of protecting data in units of name lists is employed.

In the present invention, users' private data is transmitted to the service provider in a protected manner and the private data is used only for the purposes that are allowed by the users. Thus, the users can provide their private data without concern for loss of privacy. Also, for the service providers using this private data, adopting this configuration should enable compliance with privacy laws and the like. Thus, the present invention presents advantages to both users and service providers. Since Hurst fails to disclose a private data protection distribution method that adopts the prerequisites that must be satisfied between an information entity and a provider when transferring private data, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-5 and 6-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurst in view of one or more Pinado et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,655), Cooper et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0051996 A1), and/or Floyd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,692). In response, Applicants traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1.

Since claims 4-5 and 6-9 ultimately depend upon claim 1, they necessarily include all the features of their associated independent claim plus other additional features. Thus, Applicants submit that the §103(a) rejections of claims 4-5 and 6-9 have also been overcome for the same reasons mentioned above to overcome the rejection of independent claim 1, and also because the Pinado, Cooper, and Floyd references fail to overcome the deficiencies of Hurst.

Pinado merely discloses a method of controlling utilization of digital content by encrypting and decrypting data. Cooper merely discloses a technique by which information can be acquired from a plurality of information supply servers. Floyd merely discloses a technique of providing when a digital content is updated the updated digital content. None of these references disclose or suggest a private data protection distribution method that adopts the prerequisites that must be satisfied between an information entity and a provider when transferring private data, therefore withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections of claims 4-5 and 6-9 is respectfully requested.


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

June 28, 2007
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315
Customer No. 24978

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By


Joseph P. Fox

Registration No. 41,760